155988

C

W. G. Krummrich Plant

September 29, 1969

Confidential

Messrs. B. L. Bigge
C. F. Buckley
J. W. Molloy
M. Pierle
L. W. Sprandel
G. L. Bratsch

(1) Current Size of Aroclor Sewer Losses
(2) Proposal to Reduce Losses

Your copy of memo from BLB to BM, 9/9/69

W. A. Kuhn
B-240-N

(1) Maximum Aroclor losses to the sewer from Department 246 are estimated to be 50,000#/yr., or 10-12 gallons/day.

Basis: (a) 0.6% yield loss from production facilities on 40 M #/yr. production (Biphenyl yield YTD is 99.32%). 240,000#/yr.

Montars in drums - less 160,000

Waste Aroclor in drums less 40,000

Net Production Facility Losses - 40,000#/yr.

(b) Net Blending Facility Losses - 10,000

Total Maximum Aroclor Losses to Sewer 50,000#/yr.
(Some of this loss soaks into the ground and never reaches the sewer).

(2) The referenced memo outlines suggested pollution control work, housekeeping work, and costs for the following areas in Dept. 246:

(a)	Main process area	$6,000
(b)	Tank car loading area north of department	14,000
(c)	Truck loading area and roadway area	18,000
(d)	Tank farm area	6,000
(e)	Tank car loading area west of Dept. 254 -	7,000
	Total -	$51,000

In discussing this proposal with those receiving a copy of this memo, two additional items should be included to make this a comprehensive pollution control/plant improvement plan. They are:

(f)	Roadway north of department (Design work had begun on this project but is now holding because of tight money for plant improvement work.)	$15,000
(g)	Permanently installed sump pumps in the three proposed settling basins contingent upon loss volume. (3 x $5,000)	$15,000
	Grand Total -	$81,000

CER 098538

The housekeeping (plant improvement) and pollution control portions of the above proposal are related to each other. Better housekeeping is desirable, and for total pollution control, necessary. On the other hand, paving roadways and tank farms increases the sewer load.

Another alternative is to do only part (a) above, putting in a settling basin for the existing sewers in the old and new process areas. Including a permanently installed pump the cost would be $11,000, all pollution control money. I would estimate that this basin would collect 50% of the 50,000#/yr. estimated losses. It would also give us a much better fix on the actual losses in the various areas.

Your guidance is needed on where we go from here. Can the entire proposal or any part of it be justified at this time?

R. M. McCutchan

ghw

CER 098539